

with the IAEA, Brazil has taken the following important nonproliferation steps:

- It has formally renounced nuclear weapons development in the Foz do Iguazu declaration with Argentina in 1990;
- It has renounced “peaceful nuclear explosives” in the 1991 Treaty of Guadalajara with Argentina;
- It has brought the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlateloloco) into force for itself on May 30, 1994;
- It has instituted more stringent domestic controls on nuclear exports and become a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group; and
- It has announced its intention, on June 20, 1997, to accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The proposed new agreement with Brazil permits the transfer of technology, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It provides for U.S. consent rights to retransfers, enrichment, and reprocessing as required by U.S. law. It does not permit transfers of any sensitive nuclear technology, restricted data, or sensitive nuclear facilities or major critical components thereof. In the event of termination key conditions and controls continue with respect to material and equipment subject to the agreement.

From the U.S. perspective, the proposed new agreement improves on the 1972 agreement by the addition of a number of important provisions. These include the provisions for full-scope safeguards; perpetuity of safeguards; a ban on “peaceful” nuclear explosives using items subject to the agreement; a right to require the return of items subject to the agreement in all circumstances for which U.S. law requires such a right; a guarantee of adequate physical security; and rights to approve enrichment of uranium subject to the agreement and alteration in form or consent of sensitive nuclear material subject to the agreement.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for the purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. the Administra-

tion is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 30, 1997.

SCHOOL CHOICE

(Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of weeks ago 295 Members of this Congress voiced their support for local schools, for local school board members, for parents and for our children with respect to national testing. We decided, a majority of us in this body, that independent national testing, that parental measures of quality, that school board standards established locally are in fact the best measurements of how our children are succeeding in our schools and how our public education system is delivering quality service. The White House on the other hand persists in pushing forward their plan for government-run national testing defined by bureaucrats here in Washington, another effort by people here in the City of Washington, DC to consolidate education authority in the hands of powerful bureaucrats so far removed from the children in our districts and the schools that we represent here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stick to our guns here in the House. The 295 Members need to tell the White House that our schools need to continue to be governed locally.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a choice.

It can ignore the findings of the 1983 report on education in America—A Nation at Risk—for yet another year.

Or it can get serious and pass real reforms that have the benefit of a proven track record and common sense behind them.

Previous Congresses have chosen to sell out to the special interests and protect the status quo.

The results are there for all to see.

The other side of the aisle is proposing to do exactly that for one more year.

It's always the same story—more money into the very same wasteful bureaucracies with money that taxpayers already forked over the last time the Government asked for more money.

More Federal programs, more bureaucracy, and more control from Washington, DC.

This is the essence of how the other side thinks problems are solved.

It's time to change course. Public schools can compete in a free market—they should be permitted to do so.

It's time to change course.

Competition works.

Greater parental control and less intrusion from Washington means better decisions about how our children are educated.

It's time to give parents school choice.

VOTE DOWN OHIO'S WORKERS COMPENSATION INITIATIVE

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday the people of Ohio will vote against Issue 2 to overturn a number of destructive changes that have been made in the State's workers compensation system. Those who favor Issue 2 argue that these changes are constructive reforms. Nothing could be further from the truth. The real intent of these changes is to block legitimate applicants from receiving the benefits they deserve because they have been hurt on the job.

Issue 2 would impose upon applicants a burden of proof that would be almost impossible to meet. It would allow employers to keep their injury, disease and accident reports hidden from the public. It would cut in half the amount of time that claims would remain open for the payment of compensation and medical benefits.

If this law had been in effect in 1995 in Ohio, 9 out of 10 persons who received total permanent disability would have been rejected.

It is a total fraud to call Issue 2 a reform of Ohio's workers compensation system. It is a takeaway law that tries to convince working people in Ohio to take away rights and benefits they have had for 80 years. Stand up for injured workers. Vote down Issue 2.

Issue 2 is opposed by a broad-based coalition of citizens and municipal organizations such as the Parma City Council. I request that this Emergency Resolution from the Parma City Council be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RESOLUTION NO. 306-97

By: Susan M. Straub, Deborah Lime, Sam C. Bonanno, Dean E. Depiero, Roy J. Jech, J. Kevin Kelley, Paul T. Kirner, John R. Stover, Anthony Zielinski.

A Resolution opposing Senate bill 45—Workers' Compensation Reform Bill and urging voters to vote “No” on Issue 2 on November 4, 1997, and Declaring an Emergency

WHEREAS, the Ohio legislature and Governor Voinovich have decided to tap compensation payments to workers injured or diseased on the job; and,

WHEREAS, the most severe benefit cuts are: 1) decreasing benefits to those with permanent partial disabilities; 2) denying coverage to workers who contract occupational cancers and other occupational diseases; 3) denying coverage for those who suffer from carpal tunnel or other repetitive motion injuries; 4) decreasing non-working wage loss from 200 weeks to 26 weeks; and,

WHEREAS, a coalition of public interest, labor, and injured worker organizations turned in 415,000 signatures on petitions to the secretary of state on July 21, 1997, forcing a referendum on the so-called Workers' Compensation Reform Bill (SB 45) signed by Governor Voinovich in the spring; and,

WHEREAS, the signatures mean that for the first time since 1939, Ohioans will be able to go to the polls and VOTE “NO” on anti-injured workers legislation;